

Application No. 10/015,677

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 17 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action of February 8th, 2006 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are independent. In this Amendment, no claims have been amended and no claims have been cancelled.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Ejima et al. (USP Number 6,342,900).

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicants claimed may be briefly summarized as follows:

Ejima et al. teaches a method for dividing a single display into multiple areas for the display of multiple selected images where one of the selected images is displayed in each area.

Applicant's claimed invention (independent Claims 1, 4, and 8) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more display areas, where each display area has a given resolution and the resolution of at least one display area is different than the resolution of the other display areas. Image portions of a source image are provided to each display area and are scaled such that when the image portions are displayed on the two or more display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of at least one portion of the source image is different from the displayed resolution of at least one other portion of the source image.

Amendment

-5-

Application No. 10/015,677

Applicant's claimed invention (Independent Claim 7) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous video image across first and second display areas where each display area has a given resolution and the resolution of one display area is different than the resolution of the other display area. The images provided to each display area are scaled such that when the images are displayed the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the first video image on the first display is different from the displayed resolution of the second video image on the second display.

A claim or claims rejected under 35 USC § 102 is anticipated by the reference. For anticipation under 35 USC § 102, the claim must teach every aspect of the claimed Invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02).

Ejima et al does not teach displaying a continuous image across two or more display areas as claimed by applicant. Ejima et al. teaches dividing a single screen, in this case a screen on an electronic device and more particularly a camera (please see column 1, Description of related art and figures 1-5), into multiple areas for the display of multiple images where an image is displayed in each of the areas (please see column 13, lines 50 through 55 and column 14 lines 26 though 31, column 15 line 65 through column 16 line 6). Ejima et al. also does not teach each display area having a given display resolution and the display resolution of at least one display area being different than the display resolution of at least one other display area as claimed by applicant. As Ejima et al. is dividing a single display with a single display resolution into multiple areas (please see column 13 lines 37 through 45) the display resolution of all of the areas on the single display are all the

Amendment

Application No. 10/015,677

same. Neither does Ejima teach providing a source image to be displayed on the multiple display areas, rather Ejima et al. teaches the use of multiple source files or images where one each image is to be displayed in one of the divided portions of the single display (please see column 13 lines 35-55 and column 14 lines 21-31 as well as Figures 10, 12, and 13). Further Ejima et al. does not teach that image portions provided to each display area are scaled such that when the image portions are displayed the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of one portion of the displayed image is different from the displayed resolution of another portion of the displayed image. Instead Ejima et al. teaches the display of multiple images displayed in multiple separate areas (please see column 13, lines 50 through 55 and column 14 lines 26 though 31, column 15 line 65 through column 16 line 6).

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of screens with varying resolutions and preserve a continuous image with at least one portion displayed at a different resolution, regardless of the resolution of any individual screen by appropriately scaling the images for each of the screens. Ejima et al. does not teach or suggest any of the claim limitations. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify Ejima et al. to teach applicant's claimed invention. Applicants therefore believe the rejection is improper and that claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 be allowed to issue.

Insofar as claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are concerned, these claims all include the limitations of and depend from now presumably allowable claims 1 or 4 and are also believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claims 1 and 4 above. Applicant

Amendment

Application No. 10/015,677

respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 be allowed to issue.

Reconsideration/Admittance Requested

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

Interview Request Under M.P.E.P. 713.01

The Examiner is hereby formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney before the issuance of the next Office Action to arrange a telephonic interview so as to expedite the prosecution of the present application should the Examiner maintain the rejection(s) presented in the Office Action dated February 8th, 2006.

This formal request is being submitted under Chapter 713.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedures which indicates that an interview can be arranged for in advance by letter, telegram, or telephone call.

Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time Statement

A Petition to Revive under 37 CFR 1.137 (b) accompanies this amendment. The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Amendment

Application No. 10/015,677

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Nola Mae McBain, at Telephone Number 650-812-4264, Palo Alto, California.

Respectfully submitted,



Nola Mae McBain
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 35,782
(650) 812-4264

Palo Alto, California
Date: August 17, 2006

Amendment